DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 805 CE 022 358

AUTHOR Weqmann, Robert G.
TITLE Job Search Assistance: A Review.
INSTITUTION Houston Univ., Tex. Clear Lake City Branch.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 66p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employment Interviews; *Employment Programs; Employment Services; Job Application; *Job Market; *Job Placement; *Job Search Methods; *Program Effectiveness; Success Factors; *Unemployed; Vocational Counseling
IDENTIFIERS Employment Security Department of Washington State; Job Factory; Job Finding Clubs; Self Directed Placement Corporation; Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to review the implications of a series of programs now being conducted throughout the United States which are consciously trying to equip the unemployed with the tools necessary to find work. These relatively new programs are described as demonstrating a high rate of success in helping individuals obtain work within a period of weeks. These programs are also described as relatively inexpensive and effective for a very wide variety of individuals (regardless of age, sex, educational level, race, etc.). Finally, these programs are described as attacking the problem of frictional unemployment, which is defined as the time spent seeking but not finding an existing but unfilled job. Five programs are included in this review: (1) the Job-Finding Club, which started in Carbondale, Illinois; (2) the Department of Labor's Work Incentive (WIN) program, which funded a series of five pilot projects with each site involving a Job Club; (3) the Job Factory, operated by the Cambridge (Massachusetts) Office of Manpower Affairs and funded by CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act); (4) the Self-Directed Placement Corporation, a for-profit corporation on the West Coast; and (5) a series of work orientation programs operated by the state of Washington. Following a brief overview of each program, a discussion of their success is presented in the context of recent research findings on the American job market. Finally, the potential growth of these programs, suggestions for needed research, and implications for public policy are proposed. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174805

Job-Search Assistance: A Review

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bob Wegmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert G. Wegmann

University of Houston at Clear Lake City
Houston, Texas 77058
(713) 488-9400

July, 1979

Preface

Most of the information in this paper was gathered while serving as a Senior Fellow in the Office of Planning and Program Development, National Institute of Education, under the sponsorship of the Education Policy Fellowship Program. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Iris Rotberg, Director of the office and Assistant Director of the National Institute of Education, for allowing me to pursue this research. Any opinions expressed are, however, my own and this paper should in no way be considered as a policy statement of either the National Institute of Education or the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

It should be obvious from even a quick reading of this report that the information presented could not have been pulled together without a great deal of help from many people. This includes not only those who generously shared copies of unpublished reports and answered innumerable questions over the phone and during site visits, but those who read and criticized an earlier draft, and others who made suggestions about possible new sources of information. To all I would like to express my sincere appreciation. The responsibility for any errors or misinterpretations is, of course, my own.

INTRODUCTION

Job-finding is a learnable skill. To be more precise, the ability to find a suitable job in a reasonable period of time demands a series of learnable skills. Because some jobs come easily, and because situations demanding that a person find a new job come only irregularly (and sometimes at long intervals), many people undertake a job search lacking both critical information and essential communications and interviewing techniques.

The purpose of this paper is to review the implications of a series of programs now being conducted throughout the United States which are consciously trying to equip the unemployed with the tools necessary to find work quickly and efficiently. These programs have received relatively little publicity; some of those running them have only recently become aware of similar programs elsewhere. Though relatively new, these efforts have demonstrated a high rate of success in helping individuals, many of whom have been unemployed for substantial periods of time to obtain work within a period of weeks. The training involved is relatively inexpensive and seems effective for a very wide variety of individuals; that is, age, sex, educational level, race and other similar variables do not seem to present insurmountable barriers for those using these methods.

The need for such training is serious. Douglas C. Marshall, Legal Counsel for the Association of Washington Business, surveyed several dozen employers before appearing before the House Manpower and Housing Subcommittee. He wanted to know what they did and did not like about the Washington State Employment Service. He reported:

> The need for counseling services was frequently mentioned; apparently many applicants do not know how to present themselves physically, nor how to handle an employment interview. I am not being facetious in reporting that some applicants need to be advised to shave before an interview. They need counseling in the art of finding a job.1/

This view is echoed in the experience of Miriam Johnson, who for a number of years ran workshops in the depressed Western Addition area of San Francisco. She reports:

> In a recent survey of six San Francisco hospitals, personnel representatives were asked to discuss their reactions to applicants referred by outreach offices. The report reads like a script entitled "Why Workshops Are Necessary." The most repetitive comments made by five of the hospitals completely validate the pertinancy of this section: poor work application, poor interviewing behavior, unexplained gaps in time, no references from former employers, poor appearance, etc. The report pointed out that absence of skills to perform the job was not the primary problem, but rather the absence of skills as a job seeker.2/

Nor should it be assumed that this absence of job-search skills is confined to relatively uneducated persons seeking low-paying jobs. Newspaper advertisements in every major city offer similar training

to the unemployed professional. Career Management International and Haldane Associates are two nation-wide organizations providing this type of service, generally for a substantial fee. Other groups, such as the Forty Plus Clubs, offer similar help on a volunteer basis. The House Manpower and Housing Subcommittee heard testimony from Martin Tobin, the Executive Director of the Seattle Volunteer Employment Service Team for Professionals, who had been working with unemployed professionals for some years:

> Now the length of time, according to the Department of Labor statistics, that a professional can expect to be unemployed is 15 weeks. Through the techniques that we have developed and are teaching we have cut that time down to 8 weeks as the average.
>
> One of the prime reasons for our success in assisting our members is our career planning seminar: an intensive 12-hour course in self-marketing that is given each week. Completion of the seminar is mandatory for membership in SEA-VEST. This is because we have found that less than one-half /of one percent/ of the unemployed or underemployed registrants have any knowledge of how to find and get the positions they want or need.
>
> Briefly, the seminar consists of self-evaluation and goal assessment, job search, application letter writing, resume preparation, and interview techniques.3/

The programs described in this paper are, then, programs which attack the problem of frictional unemployment. Frictional unemployment is defined as the time spent seeking but not finding an existing but unfilled job. In The Job Market, Richard Lathrop notes that, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, frictional unemployment could be conservatively estimated at 42% of total unemployment during 1977, the remainder being either cyclical

(a shortage of jobs due to a downturn in the business cycle) or structural (a mismatch between the skills demanded by unfilled jobs and those possessed by job-seekers). Lathrop goes on to point out that, in 1977, the mean duration of unemployment was 100.1 days, with a median of 69 days. If frictional unemployment could be reduced (that is, if people could be routinely shown quicker and more effective ways to find new positions), the impact on the economy would be substantial. Lathrop estimates that subtracting even a single day from the average time spent unemployed would produce a $3 billion increase in the gross national product. If average job-search time in 1977 could have been reduced from 100 days to 90, the 1977 unemployment rate would have been 6.3% instead of 7.0%.

Frictional unemployment is particularly significant in a time of high inflation. Every day spent employed is one less day drawing on federal welfare or unemployment insurance expenditures, one more day of productivity, and one more day spent paying federal and state taxes. Because job-search instruction can be given in a short period of time and at low cost, these potential benefits are particularly attractive compared to alternative solutions to unemployment. Lathrop estimates, for example, that providing public service employment to produce a similar reduction in the unemployment rate (7.0% to 6.3%) would cost on the order of $25 billion.4/

Finally, it should be noted that the Congress has recently recognized the great need for effective job-search assistance. The

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978 provide that:

> Not less than 10 percent of the funds allocated in accordance with the provisions of this title for fiscal year 1979 and not less than 5 percent of such funds for any fiscal year thereafter, shall be expended for providing training and employability counseling and services to persons employed under this title.5/

This section of the CETA re-authorization clearly recognizes that, upon completion of federally subsidized employment, help will have to be given if those employed in these positions are not to fall back into long term unemployment. The critical questions for prime sponsors around the country are, then: what kind of help should be given, who is in a position to give it, and how effective will it be?

In this regard, it is important to note that some of the early efforts in this area have been made under experimental conditions, with control groups drawn from the same population but not provided with job-search training. We thus have available experimental data from individuals working with varying populations in several parts of the country, sufficient to draw some reasonable initial conclusions on how such services might best be provided.

The Job-Finding Club

One of the first such experimental studies took place in Carbondale, Illinois. Dr. N.H. Azrin, a psychologist, viewed job-finding as a process requiring a number of complex skills. He thus attempted to design a structured experience specifically for the purpose of transmitting these skills. The criteria for selection for what he termed a "job finding club" was that the club member had to be unemployed, seeking permanent full-time employment, and not receiving unemployment compensation. Carbondale is a small (30,000 population) college town with no public transportation and a long history of above-average unemployment. Clients were matched as nearly as possible by age, sex, race, education, marital status and type of position and salary sought. A coin toss then determined who should be admitted to the job-finding club. A total of 60 clients (28 men and 32 women) received counseling for at least 5 sessions. Their results were compared to their control group pairs, who did not receive this training.

The average counseled job-seeker started work in 14 days, compared to 53 days for the control group. One month after counseling began, about 2/3 of the counseled persons, but only 1/3 of the non-counseled persons, had obtained employment. Two months after the program began, 90 percent of the counseled clients, compared to 55 percent of those not counseled, were employed. Interestingly, the average starting salary for the jobs obtained by the counseled clients was $2.73 per hour, compared to $2.01 per hour for the jobs obtained by the non-counseled group. The five counseled clients who did not obtain a job attended very

irregulary or for no more than three weeks at the longest; all of the clients who attended the sessions regularly and continuously found jobs. The counseled clients found more professional and skilled employment.

Training sessions lasted three hours for the first two sessions, and then 1-2 hours. A new group of 2-8 clients began every other week. Sessions were scheduled daily, and clients were urged to attend each day until a job was obtained. A buddy procedure was used, car-pooling was encouraged, and "buddies" role-played employment interviews, listened in on and discussed telephone inquiries, reviewed resumes, and commented on the suitability of clothing and grooming before an interview. Families were contacted and urged to be understanding about the time that would be spent in job-hunting, the need to keep the telephone available for incoming and outgoing calls, the need for transportation, the importance of job leads, and emotional support in the job-hunting process.

Since the critical factor in hiring is often the personal reaction of the employer, personal-social attractiveness was emphasized. Records were kept of potential employers approached, phone numbers, and the results of the contact. Permission was asked to call back at a later date to check on possible new openings or new leads.

Clerical staff helped to type resumes, letters of recommendation or inquiry, and application forms. Postage was supplied. Local and area telephone directories were available, as were specialized listings of various industries, the Chamber of Commerce list, the social service

agency list, and so on. The cost of photocopying, resume photographs, postage, telephones and similar services came to $20 per client.6/ Including salaries (counselor and secretary), the cost has been about $200 per client.7/

The WIN Studies

Impressed by these results, the Work Incentive (WIN) Program of the Department of Labor funded a series of five pilot projects serving WIN clients with Dr. Azrin as principal investigator and Robert Philip as Project Coordinator. These sites began operation between October of 1976 and September of 1977. Data were collected until March of 1978, and the project report was released in July, 1978. Each site involved a Job Club conducted by a local WIN staff member trained under Dr. Azrin's direction. Clients were randomly assigned to both the Job Club and normal WIN services (which varied somewhat from location to location).

Job-seekers were told to treat job-hunting as a full time job in itself. They were instructed to use friends and relatives as much as possible in obtaining job leads. Training was provided in handling typical job-search situations (phone calls, letters, interviews). Support facilities (telephones, writing materials, photocopying, etc.) were also provided. Except for the actual interviews with employers, all job-seeking activities were carried on under supervision. Telephone contacts were used as the primary method of obtaining job leads and interviews. The personal and social skills of the individual were emphasized in addition to job-related skills.

Almost one thousand WIN clients were assigned to either a Job Club or control group. The clients were typical of WIN participants: 54% were female, 52% had completed high school 22% were veterans, 11% were handicapped, 35% were Black, 83% were mandatory clients, 15% were Hispanic, and the mean age was 35.

The overall results were as follows: 62% of the Job Club clients found jobs as compared to 33% of the control group. If those who were deregistered from the WIN program are excluded (a group made up of 15% of the Job Club clients and 24% of the control group who were dropped because of unexcused absences, or some other reason), the results are 80% for the Job Club and 46% for the control group. Actual attendance at the Job Club was a substantial determinant of success. Of those who attended six of the daily sessions (or found work before completing six sessions), 50% found work; after 14 sessions, this rose to 78%; and by 23 sessions (a little under 5 weeks), 90% had found jobs. The cost of the Job Club programs (including salaries, supplies and services) was $87 per client and $167 per placement.

There was little difference between the jobs obtained by the Job Club participants and those obtained by the control group; participants simply found jobs faster, and found more of them.8/ With the exception of "Service Occupations," (21% for Job Club members and 26% for the control group), all occupational categories were within 3 percentage points of each other for the two groups. The mean salary was $137 per week for both groups. Only 16% of the Job Club jobs (compared to 25% of the control group jobs) were in any way subsidized (through CETA or tax write-offs).

One interesting (and unexpected) finding was that 10% of the Job Club clients (compared to 5% of the control group) reported working even before the first Job Club session. Since daily attendance at

the Job Club was expected, it is possible that some of these individuals had actually been employed for some time and had been receiving welfare payments inappropriately. Eliminating this situation seems to be one unexpected result of treating job-finding as itself a full-time activity.

Although it was originally intended that each of the five sites be similar, practical problems lead to some differences in the client populations and length of treatment. Taking the situation city by city: Harlem: Clients were taken from all registrants for WIN except those who were assigned to on-the-job training, counseling, or who were illiterate in English. The program began October 18, 1976, and continued for 17 months. New Brunswick: Clients were WIN registrants who were judged job-ready, excluding those who lived too far from the agency. The program ran for 16 months, from November 22, 1976, to March 23, 1978. Tacoma: Clients were all WIN registrants judged job-ready. The program ran from June 13, 1977, to March 14, 1978, a period of 9 months. Wichita: Wichita has an extensive IMS (Intensive Manpower Services) component to its WIN program. This involves group meetings, watching videotapes of job interviews, and other traditional job-search counseling. The control group participated in this IMS component; the Job Club clients were assigned to the Job Club instead. The program ran from July 25, 1977, to March 10, 1978, a period of 8 months. Milwaukee: The clients here were all WIN registrants, even those who were judged not ready to seek work. The

program ran from October 10, 1977, to March 14, 1978, a period of 5 months.

The results from these sites are summarized in table 1.

Table 1

Site	Unemployment Rate In Area During Project	Number	Proportion Finding Jobs, All Participants		Proportion Finding Jobs, Excluding Deregistrations and No-Shows	
			Job Club	Control	Job Club	Control
Harlem	15.0%	210	56%	35%	86%	40%
New Brunswick	9.6	227	63	30	70	38
Tacoma	9.0	260	72	39	93	57
Wichita	4.6	176	60	39	80	55
Milwaukee	6.9	98	54	12	65	21
TOTAL		971	62	33	80	46

Finally, although men, whites, mandatory WIN clients, veterans, the handicapped, and those who had completed high school were slightly more likely than average to find jobs, while women, those who had not completed high school, Blacks and voluntary WIN clients were somewhat less likely than average to do so, in each case the Job Club method was significantly more successful than the methods used with the control group.9/

The Job Factory

A similar program, though run with CETA rather than WIN funds, is called The Job Factory and is operated by the Cambridge (Massachusetts) Office of Manpower Affairs. This program originated through the joint efforts of Joseph Fischer, the Director of the Office, and Albert Cullen, a consultant. Mr. Cullen had worked with the Norton Company in Worcester, where an orientation program for professionals facing lay-offs was developed. He also conducted a study for the Cambridge Office of Manpower Affairs on underlying barriers to employment. The study concluded that the backgrounds of the unemployed were not a significant barrier to effective competition in the labor market, but rather that the quantity and quality of their job seeking efforts (typically ineffectual) were the central problem. He found that the unemployed lacked knowledge of effective job-finding methods, the communications skills needed to present themselves to employers as desirable applicants, and the confidence and drive to apply themselves to an agressive job search.

Based on these findings, Mr. Cullen proposed a short, intensive program coupling formal instruction in job search methods with direct

planning and supervision of job search efforts. The result was THE JOB FACTORY. Opening in May 1976, the program defined job search activities as themselves a full-time job. Participants were expected to "punch in" at 8:00 a.m. and "punch out" at 4:30 p.m. The training allowances given to the participants were always referred to as "wages," and the director of the program was called a "foreman." In an initial interview prior to acceptance into the program, the demands of the program were stressed. Participation is voluntary. Groups typically start on Friday; approximately 20 participants make up each new group. This allows for a weekend to relax after an intense first session. Only the first 4 days are spent in classroom work. After a first day spent on introductory discussions and a review of employment history and goals, the second day (usually a Monday) is spent working up a resume and work references and doing a videotaped mock job interview. This tape is then played back and discussed. By the third day a job search plan is developed, prospective employers are identified from the Yellow Pages and industrial directories, and the "job factory worker" begins phoning for interviews. A tele-trainer has been loaned by the New England Phone Company for use in refining telephone skills, and instruction is given in how to avoid being screened out over the phone.

A mailing list and a visit list are developed, and notes are kept on all communications with potential employers. Applications and interviews are followed up by phone. Instruction is given in how to fill out application forms neatly and properly. Videotaped sessions help to polish interviewing skills: get a good night's rest; dress

neatly; maintain eye contact; bring something to read since you may have to wait; don't smoke; sell your skills; ask questions about the position and the company; never make negative comments about previous employers; address the interviewer by name, and communicate unequivocally that you want to work. After the training of the first week, those who have not yet found jobs settle into a routine of punching in at the "factory," leaving by 9:00 a.m. for interviews or to track down job leads, with group discussions and review of skill techniques in the late afternoon, and punching out at 4:30. Individual conferences with factory staff are held as necessary. As clients find employment, staff are freed up to begin recruiting for the next group.

Of the first 34 to go through the program, 26 found jobs with an average starting salary of $7000 per year. These 26 are contributing $29,000 annually in state and federal taxes; the program for all 34 individuals cost CETA $15,000.

Between May of 1976 and June of 1978, 159 CETA-eligible "workers" have passed through THE JOB FACTORY. Of these, 105 (66%) have found employment. A second factory has been opened in Worcester; if these "workers" are included, 205 have been served and 133 have been placed (65%).

More extensive data are available on those served by the program between May of 1976 and September of 1977. These "workers" averaged 11.7 years of education, 18.4 months of unemployment (all had been out of work for at least 6 months), and were typically 32-48 years old. Of the total group, 64% were placed; of those who stayed with the

program, 79% were placed. The statistical data on the "workers" seem to indicate that factors such as age, sex, race, lack of education and length of unemployment do not significantly affect placement rates. The 1976-77 participants averaged $3.64 an hour in the jobs they obtained. Six months after employment, a follow-up study of the first 25 who found jobs found 19 still employed, for a 76% retention rate. (The findings on a 30-day follow-up were 60 of 69, for a rate of 87%.) Finally, it might be mentioned that all of the CETA programs in the area have placed 589 of 1,665 of participants, a 35% placement rate.

The cost of the program is now running $334 per enrollee, and $518 per placement.10/

The Self-Directed Placement Corporation

On the west coast, and independently of the operations described thus far, Charles Hoffman conceived and founded what became The Self-Directed Placement Corporation. Hoffman, who began his work in 1973, once worked for a short time at a private employment agency in order to test his theories and deepen his understanding of how the job market actually works. His first efforts to market job-finding services directly to the unemployed met with little success. While those who followed his advice did well, many were not convinced enough to try. And the operation was a financial failure; the unemployed have little money to pay for services before placement, and it is difficult to collect afterwards. But the experience allowed Hoffman to refine his training methods, and when he applied to the Regional Employment and Training Consortium (serving as a CETA prime sponsor for the city and county of San Diego), he received a grant of $50,000 for a six-month program. He was able to successfully finish the program in three months and return more than half the money.

Because SDP is a for-profit corporation, Hoffman tends to be reticent about the details of his training program. Essentially, however, Hoffman argues that there are only two things necessary in order to obtain employment. First, one has to get an interview with a potential employer. This is the easy part; Hoffman's office has banks of phones and stacks of Yellow Pages, and enrollees are trained in how to get interviews. The really critical skill is knowing what to do during the interview, which is part believing in oneself and part knowing what to say.

Enrollees are videotaped in practice interviews, and these videotapes are played back on large-screen color television sets for discussion and review. The difference, after a week of training, is striking. Tom Kelly, an applicant services specialist in the Labor Department's San Francisco office, sat in on the first and last sessions of the week-long training that SDP provides before enrollees begin their job search:

> The first week is devoted to job-finding techniques, with emphasis on the interview and on self-esteem. "The interview is the 'moment of truth' in the job search," says Hoffman. "But most people, even sophisticated executives, don't know how to interview effectively. And, our new students are in worse shape because their manners betray that they think they're not worth a damn."
>
> On the first day of class, this becomes painfully obvious. In a video-taped mock interview with the instructor, an older women doesn't even introduce herself or say why she is there. One young man takes a seat and immediately crouches into the fetal position, with furrowed brow.
>
> "Why should I hire you instead of someone with more experience?" the interviewer asks. "That's a tough one," the applicant mumbles, as he searches the ceiling for an answer. Another interviewee answers nearly every question with "yeah" or "no" or a shrug of the shoulders. During this session, even students with extensive work histories make serious interviewing mistakes.

That was on Monday. By Friday, however, it is a different story:

> Now the students introduce themselves in strong, clear voices and sit with an attitude of interest and enthusiasm. They volunteer information and give full, responsive answers to each question. With greater confidence and self-assurance, even students with heavy Vietnamese and Spanish accents are more easily understood. At the end of the interview, each student asks

two or three well-rehearsed questions about the firm and what it does.[11]

Hoffman's contract with San Diego's RETC requires him to serve graduates of the skills training programs funded by the consortium. After training in typing, auto painting, computer operating and similar skills, CETA job placement specialists work with the CETA trainees to place them in full time jobs. If, after 45 days, these graduates have not been able to obtain employment, they are sent to SDP.

So far, Hoffman has been able to place 92% of the 346 who have been sent. Placement typically comes after a week's training and 5-10 days of job search activities. Starting salaries average $7,300. Hoffman charges $500 for each client served. SDP has also been responsible for a number of other programs. Project JOVE, a two-week program with 50 ex-offenders, was completed in August of 1977. Two thirds of the group were placed, at an average starting salary of $7,600. A pilot program for WIN participants was run, with two groups going through Hoffman's training. In the first group, 24 started, 18 completed and 15 found jobs. Average starting salary was $7,800.

Hoffman is now in the process of setting up similar training centers in several other cities, including Indianapolis and Baltimore.[12] After spending an hour or two watching videotapes of the final practice interviews of a group of CETA-eligible clients at the Baltimore center, I can testify to the accuracy of Kelly's description of SDP's effectiveness in this area. The clients came through in the interviews as

wanting to work. They were articulate and positive, handled the questions they were asked in an unflustered manner, and asked questions that communicated their interest in a steady job that had opportunities for advancement. Had I been an employer, I would have wanted to hire them.13/

In addition to the programs which he runs directly, Hoffman has served as a consultant to other programs, which use his materials and methods. One such program is operated by the Tucson (Arizona) Skill Center/Pima County Community College District under contract with the Department of Economic Security-CETA training unit, which supplies referrals as well as some counseling and supportive services. The instructors and counselors have been working to create a program particularly adapted to the needs of their client group.

The program is relatively short (two weeks). Classes begin in the middle of the week and consist of 12 participants. The first five days are spent in confidence-building, training in telephone techniques, and practicing effective interviewing skills. Participants then move to the 6 telephones in the job search room and begin phoning potential employers for interviews. Typically half will get jobs during the 5 days of supervised job search; the rest continue to follow up leads on their own and generally obtain a position within two to three weeks after the formal program is over. During FY 1978, 126 participants were enrolled in the program over a 6 month period. Of these, 6 dropped out, 2 remained unemployed, and 118 got jobs. Approximately 180 clients have been served thus far in FY 1979, with

well over 80% obtaining jobs at this point. The program serves a substantial proportion of ex-offenders.14/

Washington State Programs

Since 1972, the Employment Security Department of the State of Washington has served over 27,000 people with Work Orientation Programs. The largest of these programs, Employment Orientation, will be discussed later. The one which is most similar to the programs described so far is the Ex-offenders Program. Of the approximately 2000 ex-offenders released from Washington State penal institutions during 1978, 1018 were enrolled in this program. Of these, 709 were placed in employment. Participants are enrolled, and in various stages of the program, for a period of a month. Those placed through this program had a recidivisim rate of only 2 percent. At present the program is costing $389 per enrollee and $547 per placement.15/

The Job Market

Why do these programs work? Why do they consistently place such a high proportion of their clients in full-time jobs? The success of these programs becomes more comprehensible when seen in the context of recent research findings on the American job market. One such study analyzed social security records, and for the first time calculated national new hire rates for the entire private economy. The study defined a new hire as any worker who did not work for an employer in the previous year, and concluded that:

> The annual estimated rate of new hires by non-agricultural firms was more than 90% in 1978. This means that the average firm hires almost as many new workers in a year as its average employment.16/

What this implies is that jobs are constantly becoming available; if a given firm does not have one open today, one may very well be open next week. Hence the wisdom of asking for an interview whether there is a job opening or not, with a view to being considered should an opening come along. Another implication is that there are always jobs out there. The American job market is a dynamic, moving, changing scene. What counts is knowing how to penetrate it.

Turnover rates were found to be higher in the Sun Belt states (the South, Southwest and West) and lower in New England and the Midwest. Smaller firms were found to have higher turnover rates than large ones (an important aspect of phoning from the Yellow Pages is that this method makes it practical to reach small employers who, other studies show, rarely use either the want ads or the state employment

service, and hence are an available market only by direct contact). Turnover rates also vary widely by industry. Using a 1% sample of social security data, the rate of new hires per 100 employees during the second quarter of 1974 is shown in table 2.[17]

Table 2

NEW HIRES PER 100 EMPLOYEES

1974, SECOND QUARTER

Construction	50.5
Retail Trade	33.8
Services	27.7
Mining	22.8
Wholesale Trade	18.8
Finance	18.5
Manufacturing	16.2
Transportation & Public Utilities	15.3
TOTAL	25.0

Confirmation of these findings is available from studies of California employee turnover using wage history analysis, which infers turnover from the individual employee wage data submitted with the firm's Unemployment Insurance tax return. Among the findings: each of California's 6 million jobs in the nonagricultural private sector is held by an average of 1.2 workers in the course of a year; 85% of the 7.4 million hires made in California's nonagricultural private sector are of new employees (workers not employed by the firm within the past year); and only 30 percent of the new hires made by the average California employer remain on that payroll more than six months. Only 2% of the hires are due to net industry growth, and 4% to "normal attrition" (death, retirement and so on). But 32% are the result of matched growth and decline, as some firms expand their business while others contract; and 62% are just pure turnover, as some persons quit or are fired and others are hired.18/

How do Americans find work? The Bureau of Labor Statistics had the Census Bureau collect information on this question as part of its periodic Current Population Survey. In January of 1973, a national sample was asked when they had started their current job. Wage and salary workers aged 16 and over who were not in school and who had started their present job during the previous year (1972) were asked both how they looked for work and how they actually obtained their present positions. The results are summarized in table 3. The average person used 4 methods to look for work. The most successful methods, however, were either to apply directly to an employer without

knowing whether there was a job opening or not, or to go to an employer on the recommendation of a friend or relative (most often one who already worked for that employer).[19] As should be obvious, it is precisely these methods that are stressed in job-search assistance programs.

Table 3

How Americans Look For Work

Applied Directly to Employer	66.0%
Asked Friends:	
About jobs where they work	50.8
About jobs elsewhere	41.8
Asked Relatives:	
About jobs where they work	28.4
About jobs elsewhere	27.3
Answered Newspaper Ads:	
Local	45.9
Nonlocal	11.7
Private Employment Agency	21.0
State Employment Service	33.5
Civil Service Test	15.3
School Placement Office	12.5

How Americans Find Work

Applied Directly to Employer		34.9%
Asked Friends or Relatives:		26.2
About jobs where they work	18.5	
About jobs elsewhere	7.7	
Answered Newspaper Ads		13.5
Private Employment Agency		5.6
State Employment Service		5.1
School Placement Office		3.0
Other		11.7
Total		100.0

Seen from the employer's perspective, these data imply that the typical employer is regularly confronted with two groups of job-seekers. The first are recommended by others, often by present employees. Since the recommending employee thus takes at least some measure of responsibility for the person recommended, the employer finds this group at least somewhat "prescreened." The second group consists of persons who simply present themselves and ask about possible openings (called "gate hires" in industry because, quite literally, they present themselves at the plant gate and ask for work).

Why, then, would the employer take the trouble to list jobs with either the public employment service or a private employment agency, or pay to insert a want ad in the newspaper? Logically, only when the stream of persons who come spontaneously to look for work or are recommended by others is insufficient--a situation usually arising because the employer has a large number of undesirable, low-paid, high-turnover jobs or because the skills needed for still unfilled jobs are in quite short supply.

This, in fact, is the conclusion of a recent study. The Department of Labor funded an extensive survey of the use of the Employment Service in 12 geographically, economically and socially diverse parts of the U.S., and compared the results to a review of the want ads over a 12 month period in these same areas. The study concluded that the two mechanisms (ES listings and want ads) serve a similar market function:

> Together, they constitute a discrete, highly competitive market with characteristics which

> suggest that their universe of vacancies has undergone a picking off and filtering process through other formal and informal channels that are preferred by employers. As a whole, the announcement of a job in either or both mechanisms represents a last-resort employer recruitment method.20/

The job-seeker who limits his or her efforts to openings which are listed in want ads or given to the employment service is, therefore, not only limited to the small proportion of jobs not being filled through more direct and informal methods, but to a subset of available openings which (a) are disproportionately low-paid or demand very scarce skills, and (b) where he or she is in direct competition with every other job-seeker who has access to the want ads or the employment service listings (which is just about everybody).

What this means in practice becomes more evident in an analysis of the want ads in one Sunday's edition of the Times Herald-Record, which serves Middletown, New York, and surrounding Orange County. There were 228 ads that Sunday. Many, however, were for only part-time employment, and others were for sales jobs on a commission-only basis. All told, only 131 of the 228 ads were employer ads for actual full-time jobs in the area. Since a few of these ads offered more than one job, there were a total of 142 jobs available altogether. However, 100 of these required some special skill or other qualification (nursing degree, experienced auto mechanic with own tools, teaching credential, bookkeeper, etc.). There were thus 42 jobs which could be filled by a worker without previous experience or any special license or credential. The employers who offered these 42 jobs found themselves besieged by "a tidal wave of applicants." One disconnected his phone because of

the volume of calls. As a result, 90% of the jobs were filled within two weeks, many within two days.21/

What job-search assistance programs do, therefore, is to train the participants to penetrate what is sometimes called the "hidden job market." That is, while recognizing that it is possible to obtain a good job through the want ads or the employment service, they advise their clients to put most of their efforts into direct application to employers, with the recommendation of a friend or relative if possible. It is only by so acting that the participant has available the full range of possible job openings, rather than the narrow range that is publicly advertised.

It is a maxim in the field that the job does not go to the best person, but to the best person who makes known his or her availability. Direct application to an employer, given the rate of turnover characteristic of the American job market, is more likely to make an applicant the best person available than any other means.

Confirmation of these findings is found in a study which examined the Sunday editions, quarterly, for a five year period from 1968 through 1972 of the San Francisco Examiner-Chronicle and the Salt Lake City Tribune. In San Francisco, 85 percent of the employers, and in Salt Lake City 76 percent, hired no workers through the want ads. In San Francisco, 411 employers reported that a total of 10,686 jobseekers applied for the jobs they advertised, of which only 407, one out of every 24, were hired.22/ The open job market, again, contains only a small fraction of available jobs, for which one must compete with anyone who can read.

Finally, how much time do most Americans spend searching for work? The national survey done by the Census Bureau found that of those who obtained jobs during 1972, 65% spent less than 5 hours per week in their job-search activities, and only 13% spent 16 hours a week or more.23/ These findings are confirmed by a number of other studies. In May, 1976, the Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted a special survey among a sample of the unemployed. This survey found that jobseekers averaged six contacts with an employer over the previous month; of those who had been unemployed 4 weeks or more, an average of 17 hours had been spent looking for work over the past 4 weeks.24/ Similarly, a study by Professor David Stevens of unemployment insurance recipients in St. Louis found that, even setting aside job- or union-attached claimants (50% of the group) and those needing supportive services beyond the scope of the Service to Claimants program (10%), "...over the minimum seven week interval from prior job separation to followup interview, one-third of the respondents had contacted fewer than ten employers in person."25/ Further, as time went on the search efforts became less and less intense.26/ The job-search assistance programs, in contrast, provide a structure in which potential employers are continuously contacted on a day-in, day-out basis.

Elements of Successful Programs

There seem, then, to be several interrelated keys to effective job-finding, all of which are to be found in greater or lesser degree in the programs reviewed.

First, there is always a statistical element in job-finding: the more time one spends attempting to get interviews, the more interviews one is likely to obtain; the more interviews obtained, the greater the probability that at least one of them will result in a job offer. Second, hunting for a job is inherently discouraging, and almost everyone needs some kind of social support if slowing down or quitting is to be avoided before the job search is brought to a successful conclusion. Third, there is factual information about how to find and approach potential employers that can be efficiently transmitted in a group setting. Fourth, there are telephone and interviewing skills that can be demonstrated and practiced in a workshop environment before being used during actual job-search activities. Finally, each of the job-search programs reviewed has important effects on the attitude and behavior of the clients in these critical and interrelated areas, and thus each contributes to the inner self-confidence that comes across in an interview and itself contributes to the interview's success.

Thus the first principle of each of these effective programs is that seeking a job is itself a full-time job, to be worked at each day, five days a week. Without a structured program, as we have seen, very few unemployed persons are likely to do this. There is clearly a substantial difference between the job-search behavior of the person left to his or her own devices and that described by a Business Week article on THE JOB FACTORY:

> Supervised by Manpower Affairs staffers Peter Gerardi and Barbara Letterei, they developed their own lists of job leads, using tips from friends and relatives, newspaper advertisements, industrial directories, local service agencies, and the yellow pages of the phone book--a prime source. One worker even became an electrician's helper through Dun & Bradstreet. The average participant makes 40 phone calls and has eight interviews before finding work.[27]

In a study of the Job Factory done for her doctoral dissertation, Barbara Shapiro found that those who obtained jobs had almost twice as many interviews as those who did not, and that this was the major vehicle by which the Job Factory assisted its clients to secure employment.[28]

A key element in the structure of these job-search programs is that they provide the social support necessary to sustain this continued effort. Seeking work is often a tiring, discouraging, ego-destroying effort. Each turndown hurts. To be unemployed in our society carries a real stigma.[29] Each phone call that does not lead to an interview, each interview that does not lead to a job, provides an occasion for giving up in discouragement. Structures such as the Job Club, however, provide a means to handle these reactions, as Robert Philip describes:

> Each client keeps a chart, showing the potential employers contacted, what the reaction was and if the call led to a personal interview.
>
> "The charts are out there for the whole group to see. Each client compares his or her chart with the others' and they talk about how it feels to be turned down so often; how it feels to hear a positive answer, what kinds of methods seem to lead to a personal interview.[30]

These programs thus allow job-seekers to share the sometimes painful experiences of job-hunting with each other, as well as to receive support and encouragement from counselors who have helped others with the same problems. As a newspaper article on THE JOB FACTORY reported about one participant:

> "I enjoyed it. You do more about looking for work than you would on your own," she says. "On your own, you get discouraged after an interview that doesn't work out and say: 'Oh well, I'll try tomorrow.' Here, if you have no plans of where to look next, they will help you. They develop your own initiative.[31]

Although social support and continuing effort in the face of inevitable discouragement are undoubtedly very important, the client's efforts will have much more likelihood of success if those efforts are themselves well-placed. Miriam Johnson, whose work with the unemployed in San Francisco has already been mentioned, describes some of the problems her clients had getting interviews:

> Discussions revealed the frequency with which men asked the wrong people for work, people who do not play a decisive role in the hiring process . . . . The dreary recitals were a testimony to the excellent job done by the in-between people, the secretaries, personnel clerks, receptionists, the front office people, who succeed in discouraging unassertive job seekers and protecting the man in the back.

Even when interviews are obtained, a poor presentation at these interviews will lead to no job offer. Some notes from Ms. Johnson's workshops:

> JR was again gruff and demanding in his insistence that we give him a job right then and there. Very defensive, even rude in his replies to M's questions regarding his work search. Extremely hostile and

> unresponsive. He revealed that he had not been able to get an interview for a job for at least two weeks.

The workshop participants suggested to JR that his evasiveness, unpleasantness and circular responses were interfering with his job chances. After the workshop, the assistant leader played back a tape which exhibited his manner for him. He later told the assistant leader that he had never before realized how he sounded and was horrified by what he heard on the tape. His manner and participation showed dramatic change in role-playing situations, and some weeks later he came back to announce that he was employed by a major insurance company as a salesman, with a guarantee, after successfully interviewing with several different levels in the firm.[32/]

The interview preparation provided in a well-run program of job-search assistance goes well beyond the typical "dress neatly and don't criticize your last boss" advice commonly given job-seekers. Participants use lists of difficult questions often asked by employers and practice answering them. Parts of their past histories which might be viewed negatively are brought out openly, and stated positively. To take some of Robert Philip's suggestions, not "I'd like to be a secretary but I've never been one," but "I can type x words a minute, I've done a lot of phone contact, I'm very sociable." Someone who has been hospitalized for psychiatric reasons: "Yes, I was hospitalized and it helped me work out a lot of problems many other people haven't come to grips with." They want a business degree and you don't have one? "Yes, I did major in journalism, but

I think everybody needs communication skills and I think I can use mine working here."[33] Video-tapes of mock interviews are played back and the group is asked whether they would hire the person on the basis of that interview. Discussions of the interview give an opportunity to develop sensitivity to non-verbal behavior as well as to answers for specific questions. And participants learn to volunteer information and ask questions in a way that communicates their desire to do a good job and helps to guarantee that they will be taken seriously.

Once learned, interviewing and job-finding skills can be used at any future time they are needed. A letter to Charles Hoffman from one of the graduates of his program gives an example:

> To further prove the capabilities of your program, I give you the following experience. I have a trailer in the Barstow area of California that I visit on weekends. On December seventeenth of last year, a Saturday, I was in my trailer with a head cold and nothing to do. I decided to use the phone directory of that area to further prove, to myself, the ability of the Assertive Training system. The first phone call, the employer was not there; the next seven phone calls there were no jobs available because of that being the slow season; the ninth phone call was to Barstow Chevrolet and led to an interview with a Mr. Money, the Service Manager. After that interview with Mr. Money, I was offered a job with that agency for excellent money.

The author of this letter had completed a 20-week Shell auto mechanics course but found only three minimum wage jobs until taking Hoffman's course, which led to several job offers and a position with an auto clinic in San Diego. The author does not say if he decided to move to Barstow after the experience in his letter.[34]

Finally, there is the importance of the inner confidence that does (or does not) come through in a job interview. This issue is always an unspoken agenda in job-search training; in some programs, it is explicitly addressed. In Miriam Johnson's workshops, the "official" goal was to solve job problems, but the covert goal was always to work on the participant's self-image. As she reports,

> Rarely do the men err [in a job interview] on the side of garrulousness, arrogance or overconfidence. The bulk of the men are uncomfortable, monosyllabic, tense and fearful.

They do not address the potential employer by name; do not look at the person interviewing them; do not speak of their interest in training, or future plans and goals; allow glaring inconsistencies to just "hang there"; and back into silence when an obstacle is encountered.

> There is something wrong with these men--they are sick with defeat. Defeated men are unable to recognize or use the resources they already have, let alone put to effective use the techniques for job hunting they may learn in the workshop. Defeat and hopelessness are externally expressed by apathy or rage, non-involvement or over-dependency, irresponsibility--failure to follow through, keep promises, be on time, carry out assignments. All the subjective behavior patterns that militate against a man having a satisfying relationship to work are operating and in evidence in his relationship to the workshop.[35]

This is not an easy problem with which to deal; there seems little doubt that the no-show and dropout population from even the most successful of these programs have experienced many of these feelings. But if the person comes, these problems <u>can</u> be dealt with. In the doctoral study of the Job Factory already mentioned, Barbara Shapiro found that the supervisors consciously stressed the

importance of displaying an aura of confidence to potential employers. More importantly, as the group helps each other and works together every day, all day, at getting a job, they come to see themselves as working rather than as unemployed. The active involvement in problem-solving behavior seems to increase their sense of personal effectiveness and competence. As a result, Shapiro found, there is a measurable increase in self-esteem, even among those who fail to get jobs.[36]

The emphasis on realizing one's self worth in the job-search program of the Self-Directed Placement Corporation is, if anything, even more intense. One reporter who attended some of their sessions described the discussions this way:

> The classroom work--it's closer to an encounter-group, actually--takes five full days. The written material, Hoffman said, is copyrighted, but it's impossible to copyright the give-and-take, which becomes a weave of self-analysis, confrontation, confession (either open or inward), practice in self-assertion, frank critique and blunt challenge.[37]

The sense of self-worth is, then, a critical element in a good interview. Not every participant can be reached in the short time available in these programs; but the high placement rates suggest that most can, at least to an extent sufficient to help them get hired.

Problems and Limitations

Despite these significant and positive results, it should already be clear from the data and programs which have been reviewed that job-search training is no panacea for America's unemployment problem.

First of all, this approach has limited power to create new jobs. There may be some marginal effect in this direction, in that a qualified or attractive job applicant may move a particular employer to create a new position, or to hire earlier than would have otherwise occurred. And a really large-scale reduction of frictional unemployment would itself stimulate the economy and create new jobs. On the whole, however, both cyclical and structural unemployment (approximately 60% of 1977 unemployment if BLS is correct) would remain largely unaffected unless there were mass participation in such job-search programs.

Second, this kind of training will not work with someone who does not want a job. All of the job-search training in the world will be of no use to someone who, for whatever reason, has no real desire to obtain employment. While this is not a major problem, a certain proportion of clients do fail to show up for the first session, or leave after learning the level of effort that will be required.

Third, this kind of program will not aid someone who is so lacking in work habits or psychic stability that he or she could not hold a job even if one were provided. Such persons may be a small percentage of the unemployed, but they clearly do exist and they will need more that a one week workshop, no matter how intense.

Fourth, it is not clear that these programs typically have time to do a really thorough review of employment possibilities. For some participants, of course, this is not an issue: they know what kind of work they have done in the past, they were satisfied with it and they want to do it again. For others, however, this is not the case. While most programs have the participants analyze their past jobs and other accomplishments in order to identify their strongest skills, so that this information can be presented in a skills-oriented resume and used in their interviews, the programs do not generally have time for extensive discussion of how this particular combination of skills and personal traits fits best with a given occupation or group of occupations. Yet the heart of wise vocational decision-making is, after all, the finding of a position that demands of its occupant precisely those skills and characteristics which represent the job-seeker's strongest suit. This can be a difficult and subtle process. In the rush to get participants out into the field, successfully job-hunting, it can be too easily passed over. While it can be argued that even unsatisfactory employment is preferable to unemployment, it may not be much more preferable, and certainly does not auger well for employment stability. This is an area, at any rate, which needs more attention and research.

Finally, there are practical problems. While costs for such programs are not high, they exist. New programs face a time of start-up demands: space must be found, phone banks installed, group leaders trained. It is not unusual for programs to report

weak results until such practical problems are worked out. More importantly, although a wide variety of regular agency personnel have now run such programs successfully, those involved consistently speak of the intensity of the work, the emotional drain involved, and the difficulty of being continually supportive in the face of discouragement, tardiness, slowness in following instructions, and so on. A good sense of how complex and difficult the position of someone supervising a job-search assistance group can be is given by Barbara Shapiro in her Ph.D dissertation on the Job Factory:

> For given the emphasis upon discipline, they must be able to apply negative sanctions when necessary, and yet provide support for a discouraged client. In order to increase participant motivation, the role of a demanding task master is often necessary, while empathy is also essential. The supervisor must be able to understand and work with people of divergent socioeconomic statuses, and yet, can not get so emotionally involved with the clients and their problems that they cannot fulfill their other roles. Part of the job is to disseminate information, while another part is to be able to listen. Aside from the contradictory nature of the role, the job itself is a very demanding one, for the program is extremely intense and the hours are long, hence, a great deal of emotional stability and maturity is necessary.[38]

It seems clear that some individuals can do such work more effectively than others, and that all involved will need some regular rotation to other duties and to recreational breaks if they are not to "burn out." This can be a particularly serious problem in small programs unless some rotation system can be worked out.

For all of these reasons, each program will have its failures. The Job Factory lists data on some of its first participants. Among them:

> Male-24-White-19 years school, single, prior work: Stock Clerk, laborer. Months out of work: 7. Dropped out of the program in third week, voluntarily, after failing to show for interview with "hot" employer prospect. Severe problems with personal depression. Still unemployed as of our last contact.
>
> Female-26-White, 10-11 years school, single, prior work: Diet aid, nurse's aid. Months out of work: 24. Extreme emotional problems outwardly characterized by incoherent speech and an overabundance of nervous energy. Did not obtain employment during JOB FACTORY. Recommended psychological help but client refused.
>
> Male-26-Oriental-14 years school, single, prior work: Lab work, insurance salesman. Months out of work: 3. Dropped out of program in 4th week after 5 consecutive "no-show" days. Very withdrawn, unrealistic perception of own abilities and strengths. Has not found employment as of last contact.

Despite its limitations, however, job-search training seems, on the basis of the available evidence, to be a very cost-effective approach to reducing frictional unemployment, cutting welfare and unemployment insurance expenditures, increasing revenues from state and local taxes, and thus contributing to increasing productivity and the reduction of inflation. Equally important, it holds the potential for significant contributions to the happiness and well-being of the persons served.

Potential Growth

As the programs already reviewed become better known, and their success becomes more widely publicized, job-search assistance can be expected to become much more widely available. Those seeking General Assistance in the Carbondale area are now routinely referred to the Job Club originally begun by Dr. Azrin. In Milwaukee, General Assistance has been replaced by a Work Assistance Program with heavy reliance on Job Clubs.[39] In Grand Rapids, Michigan, participation in Job Clubs is required of General Assistance applicants, and 6 clubs are in operation. One of these clubs is run jointly by Southkent Community Education (Kentwood Public Schools), the Kent County Department of Social Services, and the Michigan Bureau of Rehabilitation. Participants are a mix of those referred by the County and other agencies and others who just come on their own and ask to participate. This club is now in its third year, and reports an 88% success rate in the reduction of the welfare roll. A new group begins every two weeks.[40]

The requirement in the CETA re-authorization that "training and employability counseling" be provided those hired for public service employment jobs is, of course, stimulating added interest in job-search programs. The success of the Five-City WIN demonstration project has lead the Labor Department to suggest that at least one job-search assistance program be set up under WIN in each of the 50 states. The national WIN office is now in the process of revising the WIN handbook to incorporate these concepts, and meetings are being

held with regional staff to discuss plans for expansion. Because youth unemployment is such a serious national problem, particularly for minority youth, the Job Factory in Cambridge has received funds to run a demonstration project for CETA-eligible students just graduating from Cambridge High School. Other programs, for both high school graduates and drop-outs, will be run through 1979-1980. A similar demonstration program is under way in Pennsylvania. Finally, President Carter's welfare reform proposals contain provisions for substantial job-search assistance efforts.

The one agency not substantially involved in job-search assistance at this time is the Employment Service. Conceived as a labor exchange by the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Employment Service defines a placement as occurring only when a client is referred to a job already listed with the Employment Service. This, by definition, excludes placements by the direct approach method characteristic of job-search assistance programs. An experimental project in California suggests, however, that the Employment Service, by the very nature of its operations, builds up a substantial body of information on the local labor market. This information could be invaluable when presented to job-seekers within the context of job-search assistance.[41] It is also interesting to note that, when the state of Washington allowed the state's Job Service Centers to compete with private bidders for state funds to operate Employment Orientation programs, 42% of the Employment Orientation clients who participated in the programs run by these Employment Service offices were receiving Unemployment Insurance payments, compared to only 12% of the clients

at the centers run by private agencies. The significance of this can be seen in the fact that the state estimates a savings of $22,772 a week to the UI fund as a result of Employment Orientation placements.[42] Since the Congress is due to review the Wagner-Peyser Act shortly, it is quite possible that allowing (or mandating) the provision of job-search assistance through the hundreds of ES offices will be seriously discussed.

The emphasis in this paper has been on programs which serve low-income populations and persons who have been unemployed for considerable lengths of time. The potential demand for such programs in the general population, however, is also great. A recent national survey suggests that 36 percent of the American population between the ages of 16 and 65 (more than 40 million Americans) are planning to make a job or career change.[43] That this is no exaggeration is illustrated by some data from the 1970 census, which asked a sample of respondents for not only their current occupation but also their occupation as of April, 1965. Overall results show that nearly one-third (32.2 percent) of those working in 1965 had changed to a different occupation by 1970.[44] Richard Bolles' intriguing book, What Color is Your Parachute?, based on the job-search assistance program of John Crystal, has been on the best-seller lists for months.[45] As a result of training offered by Crystal, Bolles and others, some colleges and universities are offering job-search assistance through workshops available as part of the career planning and placement program, and a few are even offering courses which cover the area in depth.[46]

Needed Research

If the present rapid growth in job-search assistance programs is to be as healthy and cost-effective as possible, there are two areas in which research is badly needed. The first need is to isolate the most important elements in this training, so that the most cost-effective programs may be designed. The second concerns the lack of longitudinal data on program participants.

As we have seen, programs are of varying length. While most seem to prefer a four-week format, two-week programs are not uncommon (the JOB FACTOR is running two-week programs for persons whose public service employment appointments are running out, and two-week programs in Arizona and San Diego have already been mentioned). For some years now, the State of Washington has been running a one-week program entitled Employment Orientation. Provided by a variety of contractors, these programs served 5,441 persons during the period from mid-October, 1977, to November 30, 1978. There are no eligibility requirements; the programs are state funded, with $1.2 million provided for the 1977-1979 biennium. A sixty-day follow-up shows the programs to be averaging approximately 40% placement rates. Since full-time job search activities are not required, and since the registrants are more likely to be seeking professional jobs (other things being equal, higher-paying jobs take longer to find than lower-paying ones), the results are not directly comparable to those from the other programs discussed in this paper. They do, however, at least suggest that the supervised job search activities of the other programs might contribute substantially to their success.

On the other hand, OPTIONS, a program located in rural northern California, (Arcata, Humboldt County), provides job search assistance for CETA participants nearing the end of public service employment (PSE), and for other referrals from CETA and OJT programs. Originally offering separate workshops in resume writing, interviewing, and assertiveness training, the staff at OPTIONS pulled these together into a total job-search package. The program takes only 5 mornings, pays no training stipends, and costs $160 per participant. Great stress is placed on effective interviewing, but little on the use of the telephone. In this rural environment, personal contact through a "who you know" network is seen as more effective. Originally serving 150 PSE participants during 1977-78, the program has been expanded to include CETA-eligible clients generally, and will serve 200-280 people this year. Of those participants who complete the program (93%), 80% are employed after 60 days (some in subsidized jobs). Although the staff at OPTIONS feel that supervised job-search in the period beyond the week's training would be very desirable, and would also prefer to pay the training stipend offered by the other CETA-funded programs described in this paper, the program as it is seems to be surprisingly effective.[47/]

We simply don't know which of the various elements of job-search training are the most critical. Could much be done by simply giving those seeking employment a booklet to read on their own? Is the quality of interviewing training the key to really high effectiveness (my own suspicion)? How critical is the group support during the job-

search period? Is there some way to tell which individuals will need more assistance than a given program offers? Or is just keeping in touch with someone in and of itself likely to produce a significant impact, even without formal instruction or group support?

An example of the latter approach is provided by the Nevada Claimant Placement Project. This project was designed to test the hypothesis that both unemployment insurance claimants and the Employment Security System would be better served by a genuinely cooperative effort. Four Employment Service/Unemployment Insurance teams, each with an employment specialist and a UI specialist, were formed: one in Reno, one in North Las Vegas, and two in Las Vegas. The teams were held harmless from the usual cost models (which emphasize speed of claim processing for UI and placement only in listed jobs for ES). Teams were given wide latitude in their procedures; they could work with claimants in any way they thought effective. A sampling of unemployment insurance claimants who had received three weekly checks was informed that reporting to one of these teams was a condition for receiving further checks. Although claimants were to be provided with more personal attention than is typically the case, no changes were made in basic UI policies or regulations. The job order listings of the Employment Service were available and were used, but the team felt free to suggest other ways to find employment also. Approximately a half hour was spent on the initial interview, and perhaps 15-20 minutes in weekly follow-up sessions. Any help that was asked (preparing a resume, suggestions on where to look for employment

possibilities, and so on) was provided. A log was kept of the claimant's job-search activities.

This project was conducted between February 28, 1977, and March 1, 1978. During this one-year period, 3,545 claimants were assigned to the project, two test claimants per control claimant. Both test and control group were 65% male, 87% white, and had a potential duration of 22.4 weeks of unemployment compensation. The average age of the test group was 40; of the control group, 41.

Despite the program's relative lack of structure (certainly far below that of the other programs reviewed in this paper), unemployment payments to the test group were reduced by $753,716 from what would be estimated on the basis of the control group's experience. This represents an average savings of $318 per claimant, and a return of $6.50 for every dollar above normal costs invested in the project.

The reason for this savings is that 2.8 times as many persons were found by the more intense initial screening to be unqualified for unemployment compensation; that 3.2 times as many persons in the treatment group were successfully placed in new jobs; and that, as a result, only 9.1% of the treatment group (compared to 35.4% of the control group) exhausted their unemployment benefits. These results held without reference to sex or age, location of the team, labor force size, or rate of unemployment. The only significant difference observed was between union and non-union claimants (union claimants tended to wait for their turn on the union hiring list.[48/]

Results like this suggest that it might be possible to offer job-search assistance on several levels. One level might be minimal (some people may, indeed, only need a booklet with some critical information about the job market and how to penetrate it, or one or two morning's instruction with the option of dropping in should questions or problems arise). A more intense level might be appropriate for those who are still unable to connect with the job they are seeking after 6-8 weeks of effort.

For now, what we need are studies which vary the format of job-search training in such a way that the effects of the different components can be compared, both in themselves and on different client populations. It is particularly important that these studies follow the participants in such programs over a considerable period of time. We do not now have such longitudinal data. Most of the programs described in this paper have as their ideal the teaching of a lifetime skill. Their goal is not just to show the client how to obtain a job now, but how to do so at any future time that he or she may need one. Over and over in descriptions of these programs one will find the old quotation about the superiority of showing someone how to fish rather than just giving him a fish. In fact, however, we do not know whether this is true. To determine long-term effects, it will be necessary to follow both a treatment group and control group over a period of years to see what differences are actually to be found over time. Only then will we know whether job-search training imparts a permanent skill. Admittedly, this is asking a lot of a program that only lasts

1-4 weeks. Still, it is a question that needs to be researched.

Clearly, these two research needs are related. It might be that a given approach to job-search training would be reasonably successful in the short run, but with far less carry-over effect than a different approach which, however, had about the same short-term impact. We need, in other words, to determine which elements of job-search training have which effects on which populations in both the short and the long run.

Implications for Public Policy

Despite the remaining questions about the optimal structure for job-search assistance, the available evidence strongly suggests the need for large-scale demonstration projects to test the feasibility of routinely using job-search assistance programs in the following situations:

First, as a condition for continuing payments to unemployment insurance recipients who remain unemployed beyond four or five weeks. Available data indicate that re-employment for many of these persons could be significantly speeded up, with substantial savings in unemployment insurance payments.

Second, before placement in scarce public service employment positions and other similarly expensive programs. Job-search training should help those who are able to obtain jobs on their own to do so quickly. Limited funds for intense personal counseling or public service employment could then be concentrated on genuinely difficult social and personal situations. The government would thus truly be only an "employer of last resort."

Third, at the completion of government sponsored training programs. The funds invested in such programs are in danger of being wasted unless those who have completed them are quickly placed in jobs where these new skills will be used. It is the failure to obtain placement after training which has been the Achilles' heel of such programs; job-search assistance holds promise of solving that problem.

Fourth, upon discharge from prison. Ex-offender job-search assistance programs are amongst the most successful and effective programs now operating. The routine provision of such training could

significantly reduce recidivism and contribute to a much smoother transition to society.

Fifth, upon graduation (or dropping out) from high school, particularly for those who are not going on for further education. Many of the concepts and skills of job-search training programs could easily be integrated into the regular high school curriculum: resume writing would certainly be appropriate in English class, interviewing in speech or English, the nature of the job market in economics or sociology. Then, upon leaving school and seeking full-time employment, these skills could be reviewed, integrated, and practiced.

Finally, as a conveniently available option for anyone seeking to use the State Employment Service. However reasonable the labor exchange model may have been when the Wagner-Peyser Act was originally passed, the research evidence now available strongly suggests that many job-seekers would be far better served by effective training in finding their own jobs than by exposure to the limited number of openings that are eventually listed with employment service. This would necessitate changing the requirement that only placements in positions previously listed with the employment service count in measures of ES effectiveness.

In each of these situations, and no doubt in others, job-search training holds out the promise of a very cost-effective approach to the reduction of frictional unemployment, a decrease in welfare and unemployment insurance expenditures, an increase in state and federal taxes, and thus an overall contribution to both productivity and a lessening of inflation. Equally important, job-search training holds out the real promise of contributing to the happiness and well-being of those to whom it is offered.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Operation of the U.S. Employment Service," Hearings before the House Manpower and Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976):p.129.

2. Miriam Johnson, "The Workshops: A Program of the S.F. Adult Project of the California State Employment Service," unpublished paper (San Francisco: Adult Opportunity Center, 1967): p.48. I wish to thank Jim Zurer of the Washington, D.C. WIN office for supplying this paper and the Azrin study.

3. "Operation of the U.S. Employment Service," p.134. It is clear from the discussion on p.148 that the phrase "of one percent" was accidentally omitted, so I have replaced it.

4. Richard Lathrop, The Job Market (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Job Market Studies, 1978). The data cited are found on pages 5-29. I wish to thank Dick Lathrop for his encouragement of my interest in this area, and particularly for his supplying many of the leads which lead to my gathering the information summarized in this paper.

5. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, Public Law 95-124, 29 USC 963, Sec. 603(a).

6. N. H. Azrin, T. Flores and S. J. Kaplan, "Job-Finding Club: A Group-Assisted Program for Obtaining Employment," Behavior Research and Therapy, 13 (1975): pps. 17-27.

7. The total cost figure is taken from the report cited in footnote 9.

8. This is consistent with the experience of an experimental program described by Lathrop in The Job Market, pps. 25-26.

9. All of this information is summarized from "The Job-Finding Club as a Method for Obtaining Employment for Welfare-Eligible Clients: Demonstration, Evaluation, and Counselor Training," Final Report to the U.S. Department of Labor on Grant # 51-17-76-04, July 28, 1978.

10. I wish to thank Joseph Fischer, Director of the Cambridge Office of Manpower Affairs, for providing this information.

11. Tom Kelly, "Putting Job Hunters on the Scent," Worklife (October, 1977): p.26. Tom Kelly has been a leading proponent behind the increasing use of job-search training on the west coast, and I wish to thank him for the help and references he provided in the preparation of this paper.

12. I wish to thank Charles Hoffman for supplying this information, and for stopping by to discuss it.

13. I wish to thank Kathy DuChene, who runs the Baltimore office, for her graciousness in allowing me to sit in on two days of their workshops, and her discussion of the program afterwards. She reports that 113 participants, all CETA-eligible and 96% minority, participated in the first five classes at the Baltimore Center. 72% of these had jobs at the end of the three weeks of job search (which followed one week of training); the average wage was $4.02 per hour or $8,362 per year.

14. I wish to thank Chris Montiel of the Center for supplying this information.

15. Information on the Washington programs is taken from Work Orientation: 1978 Progress Report (Olympia, Washington: State Employment Security Department, 1979).

16. Malcolm Cohen and Arthur Schwarz, "New Hire Rates-A New Measure," (Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1979): p. 19.

17. The table is adapted from "New Hire Rates-A New Measure,": p. 5.

18. This information is taken from Glen Siebert, "Employment Service Potential," (Sacramento, California: Employment Research Section, California Employment Development Department, 1977). I wish to thank Marged Sugarman for her help in obtaining this and other information.

19. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 1886, "Jobseeking Methods Used by American Workers," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975). The data in table 3 are adapted from pages 4 and 7. A similar study in 20 representative American cities with populations of 100,000 to 250,000 found very similar results. See U.S. Department of Labor, "Recruitment, Job Search and the U.S. Employment Service," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976). For a table listing 30 studies on which channels, formal and informal, were most effective in finding jobs, see David W. Stevens, "A Reexamination of What Is Known About Jobseeking Behavior in the United States," in Labor Market Intermediaries (Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1978): pps. 99-101.

20. U.S. Department of Labor, "The Public Employment Service and the Help Wanted Ads: A Bifocal View of the Labor Market," R&D Monograph 59, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978): p. 90.

21. Herbert E. Meyer, "Jobs and Want Ads: A Look Behind the Words," Fortune (November 20, 1978): pps. 88-90, 94, 96.

22. Miriam Johnson, "The Role of Help Wanted Ads," in Labor Market Intermediaries: pps. 169-193.

23. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 1886, p. 51.

24. Carl Rosenfeld, "Job Search of the Unemployed, May 1976," Monthly Labor Review 100 (November, 1977): pps. 39-43.

25. David W. Stevens, "Unemployment Insurance Beneficiary Job Search Behavior: What is Known and What Should be Known for Administrative Planning Purposes," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1977): p. 22.

26. All of which raises the issue of the "discouraged worker," the person who would really like a job, but who, at least for the time being, has stopped trying to find work. On this see Stuart H. Garfinkle, "The Outcome of a Spell of Unemployment," Monthly Labor Review 100 (January, 1977): pps. 54-57, and Kim B. Clark, "Labor Force Transitions and Unemployment," unpublished paper, Office of Research and Evaluation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Evaluation and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, 1978. Clark argues that the extremely high rates of transition between unemployment and the "not in the labor force" state make many persons in these two states functionally indistinguishable.

27. "Teaching Workers How To Find A Job," Business Week (November 1, 1976): p. 37.

28. Barbara Shapiro, "Employment and Self Esteem: an Evaluation of the Cambridge Job Factory, a Manpower Program under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)," unpublished Ph.D dissertation (Medford, Massachusetts: Tufts University, 1978).

29. I vividly remember, as a graduate student, being referred by the University Health Service to a specialist for a sinus problem. The nurse asked my occupation. I proudly replied, "Ph.D candidate." She wrote down, "unemployed." I was crushed.

30. Joanne Wood, "Job-finding secret: Treat looking for a job AS a job," Southern Illinoisan (February 26, 1978). I wish to thank Mr. Philip for supplying this article and other material.

31. Jean Dietz, "Being Paid While Finding Work," The Boston Globe (November 22, 1976).

32. "The Workshops: A Program of the S.F. Adult Project of the California State Employment Service," pps. 7, 53.

33. Judith Wax, "Mission Employable," New York Times Magazine (Sunday, June 20, 1976): pps. 19-20, 56.

34. Copies of this letter, and other materials, may be obtained from The Self-Directed Search Corporation in San Diego.

35. "The Workshops: A Program of the S.F. Adult Project of the California State Employment Service," pps. 67-68, 77.

36. "Employment and Self Esteem: an Evaluation of the Cambridge Job Factory, a Manpower Program under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)," p. 224.

37. Michael Grant, "Job-Acquiring Skill Is Taught By 'Facilitator'," San Diego Union (July 31, 1977).

38. "Employment and Self Esteem: an Evaluation of the Cambridge Job Factory, a Manpower Program under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)," pps. 68-69.

39. The early history of the Work Assistance Program is described in "Workshop on Work Assistance," available from Ronald San Felippo at the Jewish Vocational Service in Milwaukee.

40. I wish to thank Evert Vermeer, Director of Kent County Department of Social Services, for supplying a copy of "Job Club A Cooperative Program," describing their program.

41. An excellent description of an experimental program that did just this can be found in Miriam Johnson, Counterpoint (Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Company, 1973), especially in Chapter 5, "The Hayward Experiment." My thanks to Bonnie Coe and Miriam Johnson for bringing this and other information to my attention. See also Miriam Johnson and Marged Sugarman, "Job Development and Placement: CETA Program Models," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978).

42. Work Orientation: 1978 Progress Report, pps. 13-15, 44.

43. Solomon Arbeiter, Carol Aslanian, Frances Schmerbeck and Henry Brickell, "40 Million Americans in Career Transition," (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978).

44. Dixie Sommers and Alan Eck, "Occupational Mobility in the American Labor Force," Monthly Labor Review 100 (January, 1977): pps. 3-19.

45. Richard Bolles, What Color is Your Parachute? (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 1979). Also excellent is Richard Lathrop, Who's Hiring Who? (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 1977). Lathrop's book is oriented to the whole range of job seekers, from high school dropouts to professionals, and has an unusually good sample of skills-oriented resumes (or "qualifications briefs," as he calls them).

46. The author teaches such a course at the University of Houston at Clear Lake City.

47. I wish to thank Ann de Haven May of OPTIONS for supplying this information.

48. These data are summarized from John P. Steinman, "The Nevada Claimant Placement Project," (Carson City, Nevada: Employment Security Department, State of Nevada, 1978), and from additional information supplied by Mr. Steinman.